

1965

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to speak against something that might present a precedent which after reflection all my colleagues could well regret.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STRATTON). The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

LET LEGISLATORS KNOW

(Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the Mellus newspapers on January 27, 1965, merits the attention of this Congress. The publisher, William S. Mellus, has effectively explained to the readers of his chain of newspapers, circulated in the downriver suburbs of Detroit, the tremendous impact that citizens may wield by letting their Congressmen and State legislators know of their opinions.

To encourage his readers to send their viewpoints to their legislators, Mr. Mellus has published the names and addresses of the U.S. Senators from Michigan, and of the Congressmen, State senators, and State representatives whose districts are in his newspapers' circulation area.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Mellus newspapers are performing a valued public service worthy of emulation by newspapers throughout the Nation. In view of its brevity, I have asked unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks:

LET LEGISLATORS KNOW

In order that our democracy may operate in a manner to fulfill the lofty principle so eloquently stated by Abraham Lincoln in his oft-quoted "of the people, by the people and for the people," it is necessary that those in charge of our Government know what the people want.

The best way for the leaders to find out is for the citizens to tell them. Since personal contact with Senators and Representatives on the State and National level is impossible for all but a very few, the most effective way to get this information to the legislators who represent us is by writing letters.

An individual may ask himself, "What is the use of my writing? I'm just one person and who will pay attention to me?"

It is true that the beliefs and wants of one person may seem insignificant, and his influence may appear to be scarcely noticeable in a nation of nearly 200 million citizens. However, these individual ideas and desires are the fibers that make up the wool and warp of our national consciousness.

Like the tiny threads that are intertwined and woven to produce a rope of great strength, the thought of millions of individual citizens combine to establish patterns of thinking which determine the direction and extent of our national progress.

Unexpressed, the ideas have no effective meaning or strength. Made known in sufficient volume, they become forces which no political leader can long ignore. Our Nation was founded upon the fundamental truth that "in union there is strength." This is as true and as vital now as it was in our earliest days.

On many occasions, the Mellus newspapers have expressed views editorially upon matters of public interest. We often have urged that our readers write to Michigan's State senators and representatives in Lan-

sing and their counterparts in Washington, expressing support of or opposition to important measures. We have made it a practice to list the names and addresses of the legislators or other public officials to whom letters should be directed.

The recent redistricting of Michigan's legislative and congressional districts resulted in changes of long-familiar boundaries. As an aftermath, many citizens are uncertain as to the districts in which they now reside, and as to the names of their State and National Legislators.

To overcome this confusion and to enable our readers to readily communicate with their Senators and Representatives both in Lansing and in the National Capital, the Mellus newspapers today inaugurate a special service.

We might describe it humorously as "an aid to people who want to get something off their chests." At any rate, in a special feature elsewhere on this page will be found a complete list of the State senatorial and representative districts and the congressional districts in the communities within our circulation area.

Also listed are the names of each State senator, State representative, U.S. Senator, and Congressman who represents any part or all of this area. This feature will be kept in type and will be published in our newspapers from time to time as space permits. We urge our readers to clip the directory and file it for handy reference.

We also recommend that they write frequently to their legislative representatives, expressing their views on subjects of interest and importance.

And we further request that our readers mail us copies of their letters for our "Letters to the Editor" columns so that we may let others share their ideas.

Let us all do our best to make this truly a government of and by the people, as well as for the people.

Bill file ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FREEDOM ACADEMY

(Mr. GURNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, since the end of World War II, the single, overriding issue in foreign affairs, has been the worldwide struggle against communism. The United States has poured over \$100 billion into its foreign aid programs in this fight. We have fought a major war, the Korean conflict, which we failed to win. We settled for a truce. We are now engaged in another war, in faraway southeast Asia, which we are losing badly.

This desperate struggle has forced the United States to maintain a costly defense establishment, on which we spend some \$50 billion a year.

The high cost of foreign aid and maintaining large numbers of troops abroad, has resulted in a steady outflow of gold. Our gold stocks are now so dangerously low, that the administration is about to ask the Congress to pass legislation to withdraw the support of gold from our own currency, in order to meet our international obligations.

Despite these tremendous efforts on our part, we are not winning the struggle against communism. In Asia, communism has made tremendous advances, and may well be on the brink of engulfing this whole region.

In Africa, there is daily evidence of growing Communist influence among the new nations there. Communist agitators are appearing all over the continent, and well planned, amply financed Communist activity is ever expanding.

In Latin America, Communist Cuba has become the strongest military power in the hemisphere, outside of the United States, and from this unhappy island a steady flow of Communist terrorists spew out to the rest of the Latin nations, whose mission it is to try to convert and subvert the rest of Latin America to the godless, freedomless society that is communism.

It is plainly evident that if this Nation is to win this struggle against communism, that we must change our tactics and learn and practice new techniques.

I am today introducing a bill, which I firmly believe, is a long step in the right direction of a new approach in meeting communism on far more favorable terms and give us hope of eventually winning against it.

This is the Freedom Academy bill. I hasten to point out that this idea is not mine, but was conceived by Mr. Alan Grant, of Orlando, Fla., some years ago, who has spent a very considerable portion of his life and his energies and his money in seeking a meaningful solution to this struggle with communism.

The Freedom Academy idea is so simple, and to me so plainly sound, that it is hard to see why the Congress does not adopt it forthwith.

This bill would establish a school for the special training of people who would fight this Nation's battles against communism in the cold war spheres.

We have three splendid service academies to train our young men to lead our Armed Forces. We spend large sums to send them to graduate schools for further training.

Since the struggle with communism is largely a cold war, and not a shooting war, why do we not train our people for this kind of conflict also? Our cold war soldiers need to know and understand the Communist philosophy of government and its dedication to world conquest. Especially must they know the methods by which the Communists seek to conquer. They need to know the language and customs of scores of foreign nations where the cold war is being fought, so that Americans can go to these foreign nations and convince their citizens of the friendship of America, and the danger of communism. They need training in as many variety of ways to meet and successfully defeat communism as the mind of freemen can conceive.

We have been like amateurs against professionals in this conflict. The Communists train their people intensively in special schools for work abroad. We do not give our people similar training. Obviously, we are at a disadvantage.

This Nation has all the resources it needs to successfully stem the tide against communism. There are young people in abundance who would welcome the opportunity to meet this challenge. We can put together a superb faculty, equipped with the necessary tools for teaching. All we need to do is to pass

the necessary legislation, this Freedom Academy bill, to get this vital project underway.

Now I do not contend that communism will fold its tent and quietly steal away with the founding of a Freedom Academy. I do say that we will have at our disposal another sorely needed weapon to use in this struggle, a means of training highly skilled people who will be far more adequately prepared to lead our Nation and freemen everywhere in this life and death worldwide struggle with Russian and Chinese communism.

Let us delay no longer. Let us pass this legislation.

THE DEATH OF SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

(Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed the passing of a man who stands without question as the outstanding world figure of this century.

Sir Winston Churchill played such a vital role in the history of his nation and of the world that his impact will be felt and his name remembered so long as man inhabits this earth.

Sir Winston was a man of such widely varied talents that no one word can be used to describe him. He was a statesman, soldier, writer, orator, lecturer, painter, historian, and humanitarian. He was the very symbol of the British Empire at its best—tough, cocky, stubborn, confident, humorous, and capable.

To us who were privileged to share the stage of world events with Sir Winston, his memory will remain as an enduring monument to the principles in which he believed and for which he fought. Before any other world leader, he recognized and warned of the evils and dangers of Nazi Germany. Two decades ago, he foresaw the coming struggle against world communism.

Throughout his long life, he was an implacable foe of tyranny in any form, and fought with determination to protect and expand the advances that mankind had made toward freedom and dignity.

The English nation owes him a debt of gratitude that cannot be measured. In the darkest days of World War II, when it seemed that no power on earth could stop the Nazi juggernaut, Sir Winston stood with inflexible courage and confidence. With his incomparable mastery of the English language, he bolstered the sagging hearts of the English people, and gave them new confidence that their empire would continue. When he stated, simply and calmly, "We shall never surrender," Englishmen and free people everywhere took heart. They suddenly knew, somehow, that this man was right; that Britain would not surrender and that the cause of freedom would prevail.

The United States, and the world, share this debt of gratitude to Sir Winston. Without his valiant leadership and courage, who knows what course the war might have taken? Who can tell what course history would have followed had

not the inspired English rallied behind Churchill to halt the tide of Nazi victory in time for the United States to join in the battle?

It is indeed fitting, Mr. Speaker, that Sir Winston Churchill was made an honorary citizen of our country. For we can now share with the British Commonwealth the feeling that we have lost one of our own.

During the grim and bleak days when the Royal Air Force singlehandedly stood off Germany's attempt to bomb England into submission, Winston Churchill uttered a phrase which has become a byword of the English language:

Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to borrow this statement today, and rephrase it to remind the people of the United States that never in the course of human history have so many owed so much to one man.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FLYNT) makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 8]

Abernethy	Fascell	O'Neal, Ga.
Adair	Fraser	Passman
Anderson, Ill.	Gray	Powell
Ashbrook	Grover	Pucinski
Betts	Gubser	Reinecke
Bingham	Harsha	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bolling	Herlong	Rivers, Alaska
Brademas	Holtfield	Ronan
Brooks	Holland	Roosevelt
Brown, Calif.	Hutchinson	Scheuer
Burleson	Jacobs	Shipley
Burton, Calif.	Jarman	Sikes
Cabell	Jones, Ala.	Skubitz
Cederberg	King, Calif.	Staggers
Celler	Landrum	Sullivan
Clark	Lindsay	Toll
Coleman	Long, La.	Tunney
Conte	Long, Md.	Tupper
Corman	Love	Tuten
Craley	McCarthy	Utt
Davis, Ga.	McCulloch	Waggonner
Diggs	Macdonald	Watkins
Edwards, Ala.	Martin, Mass.	Williams
Edwards, Calif.	Miller	Wilson, Bob
Evans, Colo.	Moorhead	Wyder
Farnley	Mosher	Yates
Farnum	Murphy, N.Y.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 353 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FARM POLICY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 73)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The bounty of the earth is the foundation of our economy.

Progress in every aspect of our Nation's life depends upon the abundant harvest of our farms.

Because 7 percent of our work force can produce our food and fiber, the vast majority of Americans can work at other tasks that make our democracy strong and prosperous.

Because our people eat better at less cost than any other people in all the world's history, we can spend our earnings for the many other things which make life rewarding.

Because we have the means to conquer hunger, we can wage an unconditional war on poverty—and win it.

The farm people of this Nation have made and are continuing to make a lasting contribution to our national prosperity. As a matter of simple justice they should share equitably in this prosperity. They deserve a place of dignity and opportunity.

Farmers want new and expanding markets for their efficient production. Farmers want freedom to grow and prosper, freedom to operate competitively and profitably in our present economic system.

As a nation we are increasingly recognizing that food and agricultural policies affect our entire economy. Sound agricultural policy must give full consideration not only to the role of the producer, but also of the processor, the distributor, the exporter, and the ultimate consumer. This is one major reason for a national investment in agricultural programs.

Farm policy is not something separate. It is part of an overall effort to serve our national interest, at home and around the world.

WHAT WE WANT TO DO

These are the objectives which should guide us:

1. An abundance of food and fiber at reasonable and stable prices for the people of the United States.

2. Effective use of our agricultural resources to promote the interest of the United States and world peace through trade and aid.

3. A workable balance between supply and demand at lower costs to the Government.

4. Opportunity for the efficient family farmer to earn parity of income from farming operations.

5. Parity of opportunity for all rural people, including new opportunity for small farmers.

The gains which we have made in the past 4 years—in raising farm income, in reducing surplus stocks, in promoting new economic opportunity in rural areas—point the direction we should continue to follow.

THE RURAL SCENE

Rural America is the scene of one of the greatest productive triumphs in the history of man. Yet, despite its service to the Nation, rural America is also the scene of wasted human talent, where there are too many people without jobs and too many with only part-time jobs.

Opportunity in rural America will require wise farm programs to support and stabilize the incomes of commercial fam-

hole is closed, this market will be lost to the domestic industry.

Paragraph (1): The Department of Defense now purchases for worldwide use more than 600,000 barrels daily of light petroleum products. Of these total purchases, more than 200,000 barrels daily or about 35 percent are purchased from foreign sources. The portion of total purchases obtained abroad has increased substantially in recent years. For example in 1954, only 13 percent of total purchases were from foreign sources. While the domestic industry is in depressed condition and there is a large shut-in capacity within the United States, there is no justification for the Department of Defense to purchase 35 percent of its requirements for light products from foreign sources. It seems to me to be extremely unwise for the military to be dependent upon foreign sources for 35 percent of its petroleum supplies.

I, therefore, propose that such foreign purchases of light products be limited to 15 percent of requirements. This would permit the Department of Defense to continue to purchase some 100,000 barrels daily from foreign sources. It would require the Department to divert some 100,000 barrels daily of purchases now being made abroad, to domestic sources. In addition, this provision provides that the approximately 100,000 barrels daily which the Department will be permitted to continue to purchase abroad shall be treated as imports into the United States.

In other words, total imports permitted into the United States would be reduced by the amount of foreign purchases. The purpose of this provision is to enable the domestic industry to maintain itself in a position to supply the Defense Department in the event that supplies purchased from foreign sources are disrupted.

In summation, the bill I have introduced would result in a substantial increase in the demand for domestic oil. Under this proposal, imports would be reduced in the neighborhood of 375,000 barrels daily. In addition, the Department of Defense would be required to divert some 100,000 barrels daily now purchased abroad to domestic sources. In total, therefore, domestic producers would enjoy an increase in domestic production of almost 500,000 barrels daily or an increase in total production of about 5 percent.

Such an increase in domestic production of oil would give the industry a meaningful economic boost. It would encourage the domestic industry to reverse the declining trends of the past decade which threaten our security as to oil. At the same time, such a reduction in imports would not seriously harm any of the importing countries. The large importing countries have enjoyed very substantial growth during the past 10 years as compared with the United States. A comparison of the production of crude oil in 1964 with 1956 shows the following: Middle East up 127 percent; Canada up 64 percent; Venezuela up 38 percent; United States up 7 percent. Under my proposal the importing countries would continue to enjoy substantial growth.

Mr. Speaker, the proper limitation of imports of oil into the United States is a matter of extreme importance to the 33 oil-producing States such as my State of Texas. The petroleum industry is a keystone to the fiscal position of the oil-producing States and to the economy of the local communities throughout the oil-producing areas of the United States. I am firmly convinced, however, that this matter is beyond the interest of the oil-producing States and that it is a subject that should have the attention of the Members of the House from the consuming States as well. Petroleum has become a necessity to our peacetime economy. It is indispensable to our military defense. For these reasons, I invite and urge my colleagues from every State to give this matter their attention because in my judgment the matter warrants your interest and careful consideration.

FREEDOM ACADEMY AND FREEDOM COMMISSION

(Mr. ICHORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to establish a Freedom Academy and a Freedom Commission for the purpose of conducting research into the methods and means of meeting the threats of communism all over the world, to educate and train selective private citizens, as well as governmental personnel, as to how to win the cold war and to provide leadership in encouraging and assisting our universities and other institutions to more effectively contribute to the conflict.

The Freedom Academy and the Freedom Commission are not products of my original thinking. They are not even ideas of recent origin. Their origin dates back to 1950 and lies with a group of dedicated Americans headed by Alan G. Grant, Jr., of Orlando, Fla. This bill is not new to the Congress. As a matter of fact, a similar bill was passed by the Senate late in the 1960 session and later died through inaction in the House. Bills were introduced last session by the gentleman from Louisiana, Congressman HALE BOGGS and others on which extended hearings were held by the House Un-American Activities Committee. As a result of those hearings I am today joining in the introduction and intend to press for immediate and decisive action by the House.

Let us face the problem squarely. We have already delayed too long. The Communists have systematically prepared themselves to wage thousand-pronged aggression in the nonmilitary area all over the world. In many areas they have moved ahead because we do not know or do not have the means to oppose them. I am firmly convinced that this measure will improve our capability in the nonmilitary area. A Gallup poll some years ago showed that five out of six Americans favored the idea.

I hope that the Members will have an early opportunity to pass on this measure so overwhelmingly favored by their constituents.

CONGRESS CAN AID EDUCATION WITHOUT NATIONALIZATION

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which would provide for the return to each State at the end of each fiscal year 5 percent of the Federal income tax collected from that State to be used for public education. This is the simplest, the fairest, and the most expeditious way to aid education.

This bill would make it possible for the States and the local communities to continue their fantastic progress in the field of education. There would be no additional bureaucracy; there would be no threat of nationalization or Federal control. This is the quickest way to help education. No studies, no comprehensive plans, and no long drawn out hearings would be necessary.

In high-level discussions on education here in Washington and in the many national educational conferences held and even in the committees of Congress, there has been little acknowledgement of the magnificent job that has been and is being done by local communities throughout the Nation. Parents, school trustees, taxpayers, teachers, and professional educators have built the greatest public school system in the world. They have moved forward to meet the challenges of the cold war and the age of astronautics.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing today is a vote of confidence in these local instrumentalities of education. This bill will complement them and give them the means to further expand to meet the challenges of the year 2000. Any Federal control of education or any Federal revenue allotted on the basis of conformity or curriculum would be a step backward. We must never lead our people to believe that the problem of education can be solved in Washington. To educate our people to look to Washington rather than themselves would be turning the wheels of progress backward.

The greatest single need of education in my own area is the need for higher teachers' salaries. I believe this to be true of all areas needing assistance in education. We must permit our teachers to compete with their counterparts in industry, in the military, in government, and in other fields of endeavor. Nothing is more important to the future of our country than securing the most qualified and dedicated to teach our children.

Of course, we need expanding facilities, laboratories, and research; but, Mr. Speaker, I repeat, the greatest single need is to secure the best teachers that we can possibly employ. The very best educational program is the only real, sure answer to the problem of poverty, depressed areas, delinquency, and citizenship responsibilities.

Last year, it was my privilege to address high school students and educators all the way from Pennsylvania to Miami, Fla. I spoke to more than 24,000 students in 38 schools, colleges, and educational assemblies. I was tremendously impressed with the magnificent job being

done by our teachers, trustees, and professional educators. I was thrilled and elated by the excellent questions propounded by students during discussions and question and answer periods. Education is moving forward. Our teachers and students are looking ahead. The vast majority of them favor this type of approach in aiding education. This bill will not penalize some States to help other States. It will treat all communities and each State fairly. This bill will permit us to build a truly Great Society.

WE TREAT OUR MILITARY SHABBILY

(Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include an article.)

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record an article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post, on January 16, entitled "We Treat Our Military Shabbily," by a former Army major, Marion T. Wood, who resigned his commission after 13 years of service as an officer "frustrated and disillusioned."

This is an article that should be read by every Member of the Congress and by every American citizen who is concerned about our national security.

We may develop the most exotic weapons systems in the world; we may build the finest missiles; we may construct fantastic underwater missile launchers; we may lead the world in equipment, but if we do not have men and women provided with a standard of living equivalent to the standard of living they are defending, then one of these days we will awaken to the sad realization that our Armed Forces are sadly deficient in two indispensable ingredients—leadership and motivation.

Former Major Wood has summarized in one article the contents of thousands of letters that I have received over the past few years from members of the armed services and their dependents. We would all do well to heed the warning contained in this penetrating article.

WE TREAT OUR MILITARY SHABBILY (By Marion T. Wood)

After 13 years as an officer of the U.S. Army, I recently resigned, frustrated and disillusioned. I was supposed to be guarding something grandly called the American way of life. But, by a cruel paradox, the society I had sworn to protect is a society that is indifferent and even hostile toward me and my comrades.

Built into the very foundation of this Nation is a distrust of soldiers, especially in peacetime. The Declaration of Independence denounces the British for keeping standing armies in the Colonies "in times of peace." The third amendment in the Bill of Rights specifically prohibits the quartering of soldiers in peacetime "in any house without the consent of the owner." In war, the historic pattern has always been the same: When war was declared, the Nation suddenly rallied an Army of civilians, trained and led by professionals who had long endured the persistent apathy and frequent scorn of their country. After the war, the civilians discarded their uniforms and became, as veterans, members of a privileged class. They were rewarded for serv-

ice after getting out of the Army; those who stayed in were neither rewarded nor even long remembered.

After World War II, the pattern of hostility toward soldiers continued. Typically, the benefits of the GI bill were extended to veterans, but not to those who decided to make the Army (or any other service) a career. Then, however, for the first time in history we found ourselves in a twilight state of neither peace nor war. The cold war suddenly challenged our historic attitude that soldiers were good in wartime and bad in peacetime, and that the best soldier was an exsoldier.

It was in this twilight that I chose the Army as a profession. Many friends and relatives were stunned. "You must be out of your mind," said one friend. Like so many civilians, they felt that the Army was a place for people who, as it was usually put, "could not do well on the outside." As a matter of fact, I had been doing well on the outside, which in my case was a small college. Membership in the Reserve Officers Training Corps—ROTC—was required for the first 2 years. I enjoyed the experience enough to continue it during my last 2 years in college. My scholastic record was high enough to qualify me for a Regular Army commission at graduation. As a new Infantry Lieutenant in June 1950, I fully intended to make the Army my career.

As I look back I still see patriotism as the basic reason I decided to become an Army officer. I have not been able to find a more sophisticated explanation. Soldiers are generally embarrassed when they try to explain what it means to be a soldier. Phrases such as "service to your Nation" and "guardians of democracy" atack in a soldier's throat, as well they should. Good soldiers are soldiers because soldiering is a very real, very meaningful profession. This is especially true in a society where many men with high-paying jobs make no contribution to society. Soldiers, at least, have the satisfaction of knowing their nation needs them. Yet from that nation, soldiers often receive shabby treatment.

My introduction to how the Army treats its own came when the Army took 6 weeks to transform me from a college boy to a rifle-platoon leader, responsible for the lives of some 40 men. Six weeks is not much time. Then I was shipped to Japan, where the Army was frantically putting together outfits to send to Korea. Some consisted mainly of stockade soldiers—men taken from military jails—and untrained South Koreans. I landed in Wonsan, North Korea, in November 1950, without winter clothing.

Our equipment was often shoddy or in short supply. Weapons misfired; ammunition was scarce. There were not enough magazines for our automatic rifles. We were on the line 8 out of 9 months. There were few formal battles or engagements. It was a dirty little war, and the worst part of it was the feeling that no one really cared.

When I got back in the States in 1951, after my tour in Korea, I suddenly was a peacetime soldier. I had been warned that a soldier was a second-class citizen in many Army towns, the communities that live off the payrolls of military bases. The principal industry in most of these towns was taking soldiers for every dime they had.

In many Army towns the citizen most discriminated against is the soldier. Some policemen arrest them with flagrant entrapment techniques. I have seen police wait for a soldier to walk out of a tavern and enter his car. As he pulled away, he was stopped and arrested for driving while intoxicated. Instead of protesting such injustice, the Army condoned it. Man after man was hauled before civilian authorities on such charges, convicted, and fined. Then these men were usually turned over to the

Army, which fined them for conduct unbecoming a soldier or an officer. The usual fine in one Army town a few years ago for an officer was \$151.50, and a similar fine was paid to the Army. At one post where I served soldiers were told officially that they should let their wives drive, for a wife could be fined only once—as a civilian.

When I was on my fourth tour of duty at Fort Benning, in 1956, about 9,000 families were living off post. Many families lived in slums. Some used outdoor privies. Others shared bathrooms and kitchens, and slept in shifts because there were not enough bedrooms to go around. Finally, the Government authorized the Army to build 4,000 homes. But members of an area real estate board complained to Washington that the building of so many homes would ruin the local housing market. The authorization was cut down to 1,000 homes. The Army consistently caves in when challenged by local political-pressure groups.

Most civilians think that a soldier's pay is tax-free, that he is financially coddled with extras that more than make up for his low pay. Soldiers do pay Federal income taxes and social security, regardless of where they are stationed in the world. They pay a 3-percent tax on food in all military commissaries. They also pay sales taxes where there are such taxes. The post exchange is highly overrated as a place for bargains. In many cases a soldier can buy goods cheaper at an off-post discount store. PX prices are deliberately pegged high enough to prevent area civilian merchants from suffering.

On-post Government housing is not free, and it certainly is not cheap. For example, at my last post, in a Government-owned housing project, I paid \$145.05 a month for a small two-bedroom apartment. My next-door neighbor paid \$175 a month for an identical apartment because he happened to be a colonel; I was a major.

Financially, the professional soldier is a second-class Federal employee. Until the cynically timed election-year pay raise recently voted by Congress, the pay of second lieutenants with less than 2 years' service had not been raised since 1958. The starting salary for a married second lieutenant, including all benefits, was about \$4,500 a year. The average new Government civilian employee starts at \$5,400. The civilian works a 40-hour week and is eligible for overtime pay. The soldier puts in a workweek of 50 or more hours; even a 65-hour workweek is not unusual. Of course, there is no overtime.

I am not suggesting that soldiering should be a 9-to-5 job with weekends and holidays off. A soldier is a soldier. It is a tough, demanding profession, and it has to be that way. As noncivilians, soldiers do not have many civilian rights. No civilian can be arrested for refusing to show up in his office or factory on a day he does not feel like working. A soldier can be court-martialed. The Army, rightfully, insists on extraordinary power over its men. The Army's mission is to defend the Nation, and to carry out this mission the rights of the Army must transcend the rights of the individual. No good soldier disputes this. And, in giving up rights guaranteed to all other U.S. citizens, no soldier expects extra privileges. This is in keeping with a fine American tradition that contrasts sharply with that of more militaristic nations.

America's long and unbroken tradition as a nonmilitaristic nation is not being questioned by the military men who serve this Nation. They do not want more recognition or more power. They simply want a more equitable share of that American way of life they hear so much about. Their demand is not merely for better pay and benefits; they are asking for a realistic attitude toward the military.